

D 515

K57

Copy 1

Compliments of the War Committee

D 515

.K57

Copy 1

DAVID KINLEY, Chairman

The AIMS and CLAIMS of GERMANY

By DAVID KINLEY

12

PUBLISHED BY THE
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
FEBRUARY, 1918

Received 1918

1515
K57

The following address was delivered by Dr. David Kinley, Vice-President of the University of Illinois, upon the occasion of the War Conference called at the University by the State Council of Defense, the Corn Growers' and Stockmen's Convention, and the College of Agriculture, for the purpose of discussing the relations of the farmer to the war and arranging a program of production to be recommended to the state.

January 31, 1918

RECEIVED

SEP 5 1918

DOCUMENTS DIVISION



THE AIMS AND CLAIMS OF GERMANY

By DAVID KINLEY

Three times since western civilization was established has it been in danger of overthrow and its light in danger of being blotted out under the attacks of more barbaric social orders. The first was by the invasion of the Huns who, in the fourth century after Christ, appeared on the eastern borders of Europe and drove the inhabitants in thousands across the Danube. Pushing westwards they later crossed the Rhine. All that had been accomplished by Roman civilization in the west was endangered; but, in the providence of God, the embattled armies of the Goths and Romans combined, on the plains of Châlons in France, overthrew the Hunnish army of 700,000 and turned back the deluge of barbarism. The second great crisis in the life of that civilization of which we are the heirs occurred when the Saracens, after a wonderful career of victory, established the banner of Mohammedanism through all Western Asia and Northern Africa and finally carried it across the Straits of Gibraltar with the avowed purpose that the Crescent which they bore was to float over a Universal Empire built upon the ruins of Christendom. "The dream of Mithridates and of Caesar was to be realized in the actual achievements of the lieutenants of the Caliphs. The Saracen chief now upon the soil of Gaul was to subjugate the Franks and their confederates, cross the Rhine and crush the tribes beyond that stream, and then follow down the course of the Danube to its mouth. Upon the shores of the Hellespont the bands of the Faithful were to join hands and together give thanks to Allah for the conquest of the World." But in 732 A. D. the heirs of the civilization of the Roman Empire, the defenders of progress and of Christianity, met the Moslems on the battlefield of Tours and, after a seven days' terrific conflict, delivered the civilization of Europe from a danger which had not threatened it since the invasion of Attila and his Huns.

Today a plan of conquest for the domination of Europe, as the first step towards the domination of the world, very similar to that of the Saracens, has endangered once more the progress of centuries of civilization. The ultimate aim of the German Empire in the present war is no less the conquest of the world than was the ultimate aim of the Saracens. In the intervals between these great crises men and nations have fought for various causes. They have warred for creeds, for commerce, for land, for prestige, and for no reason at all except the bidding of princes and kings; but never before in the history of the modern world has any nation, any people, any government, deliberately set about the destruction of their fellow peoples, fellow nations, fellow governments, for the purpose of crushing out their separate national existences, on the theory that all people but themselves were inferior races deserving only extinction or complete subordination. That this is the purpose and spirit of the German nation as avowed by its Government and its leaders in literature, education and public life, we find abundant evidence from their own testimony, to which I shall shortly advert. But before doing so it will help us to inquire somewhat into the character and growth of a government which, in the twentieth century, could precipitate upon the world so great a danger and avow itself an agent of Almighty God to destroy all that other peoples have accomplished and other civilizations have achieved.

For centuries the land that is now Germany had been torn asunder by constant dissensions and wars among the princes and small groups of people which formed the various duchies and kingdoms that made up the so-called Holy Roman Empire after imperial Rome had lost her grip upon the rest of Europe. Through generations there existed a longing among these peoples, frequently expressed in their literature, for a combination or union into one great country. The unity of Germany was a dream for the realization of which every patriotic German worked and prayed. But rivalries and disputes, due to one cause and another, delayed the realization of the dream until the middle of the 19th century. For a hundred years or more the military power of Prussia, the most powerful of the

separate German states, had been growing and it was with this as a tool that the project was finally accomplished. After Bismarck became prime minister of Prussia in 1862 a definite policy of militarizing the whole Prussian nation was adopted and thereby an army created which, when the time came, would be effective for the purposes of Bismarck and his master, King William. Cynical and unscrupulous, recognizing no law nor right of God or man that stood in the way of his purposes, using cajolery, treachery or force as suited the occasion, Bismarck, first appealing to the ambitions of Austria, made war on Denmark and took from her the provinces of Schleswig-Holstein which Germany has retained ever since. Then he quarrelled with Austria over the spoils, made war upon his late ally, and inflicted upon her a humiliating defeat which deprived her of all influence over the German states and left Prussia their acknowledged leader. Four years later, in 1870, he struck at France and took from her the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, together with an indemnity of about one billion dollars with which to strengthen and improve the German military machine. Aside from aversion to the methods, or some of the methods, employed by Bismarck to accomplish his purposes, the civilized world at large sympathized with the German people in their desire for national unity. No one appreciated the deep laid plan of the master-hand of blood and iron and his coadjutors whereby these preliminary conquests and this accomplished national unity were to be made but stepping-stones to larger conquests and wider domination.

The thirty years which succeeded the Franco-Prussian war were utilized to develop the military system which made Germany the foremost military power in the world. Meantime, the Government of the Empire set about devising conditions of social and economic life which would remove internal agitation and develop the Empire industrially and commercially. The progress of Germany became the wonder of the world. In industry and trade, in literature and education, in military growth and civil administration she assumed to take the place of leadership and was acknowledged as leader not only in these

matters, not only among the peoples of Europe, who feared to cross her will, but by thousands of our own people who, too busy to look below the surface, or too shallow in their appreciation of German political philosophy and its goal, preached and taught for years the doctrines of German superiority and German efficiency.

American students and American university professors went for higher education to Germany, and without realizing the trend of the philosophical ideas which underlay the education they received, came back in scores and hundreds to spread the story of German efficiency and intellectual progress. Some of them were slavish followers of the doctrines of their teachers, and have been unable ever to rid themselves of the imperialistic point of view which they acquired at these German seats of learning. They have unconsciously spread doctrines that are pernicious in a democracy. They have urged the adoption of German methods, standards and plans, apparently without any consciousness of the fact that these methods and plans were adopted in Germany for the sake of furthering certain purposes which have no place in the life of a democratic people. They have become in many cases apologists for things German, even some of the worst things that have disgraced humanity in the present war. They have become centers of influence for the promotion of German *Kultur* in university classrooms, in the school room and in the press. They have gone so far in some cases as to be, whether purposely or not, agents of the propaganda of German *Kultur*. Some of them have made themselves ridiculous by publishing works trying to establish the doctrine that everything of importance in the United States had a German origin; that some of the greatest writers in English literature and philosophy were indebted exclusively to Germans for their inspiration and their principal doctrines; that, in short, the roots of all that is good among the English-speaking peoples, and indeed, among others, lead back to German sources.

The doctrine of efficiency has been much preached of late years, and German example in this respect has been held up

for the world to follow. We must remember, however, that efficiency, after all, is a relative matter. Efficiency is desirable only if its purpose is approvable. Efficiency, or perfection in the performance of a given act, is worth while only if the act is worth while. To make a thief efficient is not a good thing. To be an efficient liar, or robber, or murderer is not a good thing. Now it is true that in industry and trade, in the art of war and the machinery of education, as well as in other lines, the German people in the past two generations have attained, in some respects, a greater perfection or efficiency than most of the rest of the world. They have done so, however, because they have been bending all their energies for a definite specific purpose: preparation for war. Any people could become efficient if they devoted themselves to a particular end for a long enough time. The rest of the world has thought other things better worth while. Moreover, this efficiency about which we talk so much has proven, after all, a broken reed. In less than four years since the outbreak of the war the nations which the German Government regarded as peculiarly inefficient in military matters have beaten Germany at her own game. In the supply of munitions, in the command of the air, in the command of the sea, in the art of trench making and keeping, in the number and power of great guns, in the use of that devil's device, poisonous gas, and in nearly every other respect, the military technique of the Germans has been attained and surpassed by the French and British. In the so-called chemical industries, of which it was supposed that Germany had an unconquerable monopoly, especially in such matters as the manufacture of dyes and certain kinds of glass, both the British and we have already put ourselves in a position to supply our own wants. In other words, we have not done these things hitherto, because we had other things of more importance to do. As soon as it was necessary for us to turn our attention to these we did them. There is now no dye of importance formerly imported from Germany, that we are not making. We have the secrets of more kinds of optical glass than Germany ever made. The same is true in other lines. The hollowness of the whole organization could

not have been better shown than by the rapidity with which the rest of the world has adapted itself to the conditions forced upon it by this long-conceived and slowly-worked-out plan for military ascendancy.

For education, art, religion, industry, trade, philosophy, public administration, all have been directed to the attainment of that end—the perfection of military power. German military methods became the standard for the armies of other nations. The world watched and did not understand that the awful engine of war was constructed for the purpose of terrorizing and dominating the world. Few saw clearly and fewer still believed. But it is evident now that it was all part of a deliberate plan of preparation for a war which it was believed would establish German supremacy over a beaten, mutilated, murdered world. Briefly put, the present war was begun by the German Government in order to effectuate a third in a series of steps planned since the days of Bismarck. The first was the accomplishment of German unity; the second the creation of the strongest military power in Europe; the third, the attainment of a military position sufficiently strong to dominate the world. Men ask, and History will ask, what claims, what defense, does Germany offer in explanation of such a crime.

Some German public men and writers claim that they are engaged in a war of defense, and that the responsibility for the present world catastrophe does not rest on them. It is hardly worth while, in view of all the testimony and evidence that have been published on this matter, to discuss this now. The claim was not advanced until the advance of the German army was checked. It may be said, however, that there are few incidents in history for which the responsibility can be fixed as definitely as can the responsibility for beginning this war. Following Bismarck's policy, the German Government had in its diplomacy always tried to shape events so that it would seem not to be the aggressor. This was the case with Denmark in 1862. It was the case with Austria in 1866. It was the case with France in 1870, Bismarck even going so far as to falsify a telegram in order to make his position more plausible. So in the present case. Germany accepted the murder

of the Austrian Archduke as the opportunity for her to strike at her neighbors and enlarge her power. We know now on German testimony that a conference was held as early as July 5, 1914, at which it was decided that there would be war. We know now as well as we know anything, that the German Government knew and approved beforehand the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia. Germany knew that Russia was unprepared for war, and that France was not fully prepared. She knew that Great Britain was wholly unprepared. That she knew these things we know from the testimony of her own statesmen. The very diplomatic statements made to excuse their conduct in the early days of the war show that they felt that they must strike both Russia and France because Germany was ready and they were not. She herself, as somebody has remarked, was ready to the last cannon, the last reservist, and the last railroad car. In the great mass of diplomatic correspondence between the middle of July and the second of August, 1914, there is not a telegram or a communication of any kind to show that Germany made the slightest effort to secure delay by Austria. In short, Germany not only planned the war but seized the opportune time and planned the stroke.

Some Americans apologizing, before we entered the war, for Germany's action, have assumed to take the high intellectual ground that the great conflict, historically speaking, was inevitable; that it is the inevitable result of the clashing interests of rival peoples. True, the conflict was in a sense inevitable. When a criminal breaks into a man's house at night and is discovered, a conflict is inevitable. When a band of pirates or robbers undertakes to interfere with the livelihood and orderly, peaceable living of honest men, a conflict is inevitable. If, therefore, by this statement it is intended to say that a conflict was inevitable because a group of people in one part of the world were wrongfully planning to attack another group, the statement is correct. If, however, it is intended to mean, as undoubtedly its sponsors have wished it to mean, that the clashing "interests" of the aggressor were morally justifiable, or that the aggressors were unconscious of the iniquity of their claims, or that the so-called inevitableness of the conflict

removes responsibility for it from the shoulders of those who plotted it and started it, the statement is neither correct nor worthy of argument by honest minded men. A conflict has been inevitable whenever in the history of the world brigands, robbers or wild beasts have attacked the peaceful settlements and homes of men who were trying to live their own lives in their own way. As long as courage remains, conflicts under such circumstances will be inevitable. But there is no room in the code of men of honor for an excuse or apology of this kind set up as a defense of the most outrageous violation of the laws of humanity, and the most tremendous transgression of the principles of morality and of national conduct that the world has ever seen.

One argument to justify themselves, advanced by the present leaders of German thought, is that might makes right; that therefore the German nation may possess itself of the possessions of the weaker; and that the moral law which obtains among individuals does not hold as between states, which are, so to speak, beings of a different order of morality. We need not go far to find evidence of the truth of this statement from the mouths of the Germans themselves. For example, we are told by the author of *Gross-Deutschland*, published in 1911, that: "in the good old times it happened that a strong people thrust a weak one out of its ancestral abode by wars of extermination. Today everything goes on peaceably on this wretched earth, and it is those who have profited who are for peace. The little peoples and the remnants of a people have invented a new word—that is international law. In reality it is nothing else than their reckoning on our good-natured stupidity. Room! they must make room! Since we are the stronger the choice will not be difficult."

Again we are told, in a volume published in 1895, that: "Germans alone will govern. . . . They alone will exercise political rights; however, they will condescend so far as to delegate inferior tasks to foreign subjects who live among them." Still again, we are told: "Let no man say every people has a right to its existence, its speech, etc. With this saying in one's mouth one can easily appear civilized, but only

so long as the respective peoples remain separated from one another and do not stand in the way of a mightier one." The writer of this fine piece of ethics goes on to say that if people are not Germanic, and they are essentially aliens to Germanic culture, the only question is: Are they in our way? "If they are," he says, "to spare them would be folly."

We are told that "between states regarded as intelligent beings disputes can be settled only by force." This idea was advanced by Lasson as early as 1868. He was one of the professors of philosophy at the University of Berlin, under whom, doubtless, many American students have sat. He tells us, too, in the same volume, that the state can realize itself only by the destruction of other states, which, logically, can be brought about only by violence.

Of course, in this conflict of states, the German is always the best. Professor Haeckel, whose name was once honored throughout the world, but who has joined the band of degraded intellectuals who have thrown morality, common sense and honesty to the winds, tells us that "One single, highly cultivated, German warrior of those who are, alas, falling in thousands, represents a higher intellectual and moral life value than hundreds of the raw children of nature whom England, France, Russia and Italy oppose to them." The same ethics, or lack of ethics, is shown in the remark of Karl Kuhn, of Charlottenburg, who in philosophical ecstasy exclaims: "Must kultur rear its domes over mountains of corpses, oceans of tears and the death rattle of the conquered? Yes; it must. . . . The might of the conqueror is the highest law before which the conquered must bow."

The state, we are told, need pay no attention to the moral law. As long ago as 1906 the German doctrine was expounded by various writers from whom I quote, as the right of might. "By right of war the right of strange races to migrate into Germanic settlements will be taken away. By right of war the non-Germanic [population] in America and Great Australia must be settled in Africa. . . . By right of war we can send back the useless South American romance peoples and the half-breeds to North Africa."

Again, we are told that "There [in Livonia and Kurland] no other course is open to us but to keep the subject race in as uncivilized a condition as possible, and thus prevent them from becoming a danger to the handful of their conquerors."

In short, the inferior races, and all races are inferior to the German, are to be excluded from political life. Their individuality, their political, their lingual and their moral existence is to be crushed.

At times they have been out-spoken and frank concerning their designs on other countries. Twenty years ago, in 1897, one writer, Bley, told his compatriots: "You cannot talk and sing about an indefensible watch on the Rhine as long as the Dutch and the Swiss do not sing the same tune."

"As for Belgium and Holland," Frymann told us in 1911, "it must be clear to both that this [coming] war will determine their future. As matters in Europe have come to a head one may freely avow that such little states have lost their right to exist. For only that state can make a claim to independence which can make it good, sword in hand." And with shame be it said, there are Americans who have endorsed this doctrine by writing essays to prove that Belgium is economically only an appanage of Germany and should be absorbed.

In 1901 we were told by another German that "Holland must eventually be amalgamated with Germany, as both countries stand and fall together; the same language, ideals and ideas distinguish both peoples, who must be one. . . . But Germany is in the position to dictate terms and to force Holland economically to seek union and absorption." Still again, a distinguished German economist, speaking of Belgium, tells the world that the "destinies of the immortal great nations stand so high that they cannot but have the right, in case of need, to strike every existence that cannot defend themselves, but support themselves shamelessly upon the rivalries of the great."

Under the policy of Bismarck, as I have said, German national unity was achieved through the establishment of the Empire. After that his plan was to consolidate the various German states, promote their unity of interests and ideals, and

to live on good terms with his neighbors. Germany was satisfied with the accomplishment of her unity, and Bismarck's influence was largely and strongly thrown against extra-territorial ambitions. But when the present Emperor came to the throne and forced Bismarck's retirement, a change gradually came over the mind of the German nation. As one writer, Frymann, put it some years ago: "Since Bismarck retired there has been a complete change of public opinion. It is not longer proper to say Germany is satisfied. Our historical development and our economic needs show that we are once more hungry for territory, and this situation compels Germany to follow paths unforeseen by Bismarck."

The ambition of the nation became the domination of Europe, on the ground that they needed more land for their growing population. They proceeded to argue that the land of the world was practically all occupied. Everywhere we go, they tell us, we find that the Englishman has been before us; and, they added, we know that America has begun the same land-grabbing policy, by your seizure of the Philippines, your tutelage of Cuba and Central America. Therefore, they concluded, we must tear the land from the possession of those who have it. A simple illustration will make clear the ethics of this wonderful proposition. In this country, since the adoption of the Constitution until now, there has been abundance of land open to settlement on easy terms, or for nothing. Hundreds of thousands of enterprising citizens have gone in and occupied the land, so that now our population reaches in an unbroken stretch from ocean to ocean. Now there are no more opportunities. The present generation and the next and the next, and all succeeding generations, will be born only to find the land all occupied. They want it, however, as ardently as you wanted, or as your fathers or grandfathers wanted it, when they took up the government patent for the acres that now are yours. What shall we think of a proposition that we who have come later and find the land all occupied, shall now drive you off because we, forsooth, in our opinion, can make a better use of it? Yet this precisely is the proposition of the German Empire.

It became, then, an accepted doctrine of German foreign policy, that neighboring small countries, Belgium, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland should become a part of the German Empire. Their lands were to be seized, whether the people were willing or not. In addition, northern France was to be taken so as to give the German Empire a sea line running from Havre to the east end of Prussia. This perhaps was the first form that their thoughts took,—an empire running therefore from the western boundary of Russia south to Vienna and west to the Atlantic ocean.

For one reason or another obstacles which they could not or dared not try to surmount at the time prevented the early fulfillment of this plan. But one of the remarkable features of German policy is its elasticity. It was possible to accomplish the purpose of domination in some other way. If an empire cannot be established reaching from the Gulf of Riga to the Bay of Biscay, one running from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, as the world has recently become aware, will serve the purpose as well,—perhaps better! "The territory open to future German expansion," Professor Hasse tells us, "must extend from the North Sea to the Baltic and the Persian Gulf, absorbing the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Switzerland, the whole basin of the Danube, the Balkan Peninsula and Asia Minor." So now the phrase "from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf" has become the rallying cry of the Pan-Germans.

But one thing was only a stepping-stone to another. If, in the first murderous onrush of her army in 1914, Germany had succeeded in overrunning all of Belgium, and seizing the northern part of France as far as Havre, or even Dieppe, she would have been content for a time. For such an increase in territory, if she could keep it, would give her the means for strengthening her army and navy for the next onslaught. For rest assured, there is to be a next onslaught, as I will show in another place, unless the world succeeds in destroying German military autocracy. This territory would have served as a stepping-stone for an aggression to realize the dream of an empire to the Persian Gulf, and that in turn would have laid the foundation for a new grip, reaching into Asia, for the con-

trol of India and China. These are avowed purposes, as may be learned from the works of many German writers. Failing for the present to accomplish the seizure of the Atlantic littoral from Antwerp west; check-mated in the dream of "Berlin to Bagdad"; thrown out of the colonial empire which he possessed; the German militarist now turns for enlargement of the Empire by the seizure of Poland and of Russia territory as far as the Gulf of Riga. It makes little difference where the foothold is, so long as it is a larger foothold that will enable him to prepare himself to deliver his next blow with mightier force. "Land, more land," as the cry is expressed by Maximilian Harden, who is now so frequently quoted by pacifist poltroons among our own countrymen who are seeking peace at the expense of principle. Harden was one of the loudest shriekers for blood at the beginning of the war, when prospects seemed favorable to complete German success. Lately he has been advocating what he calls a moderate policy, holding up to his country the moderation of President Wilson and Lloyd-George. Now that he sees that the purposes which he supported cannot be attained he is whining for the best mode of escape.

But the establishment of this European empire was for the purpose of furnishing another stepping-stone on which to stand and dictate to the world. "Germany," we are told by Pastor Lehmann, "is the center of God's plans for the world." "Germany," another tells us, "as the preponderant power in a Great-German league will with this war attain world supremacy." And still again, Nietzsche, writing thirty-three years ago, tells us that "the time for petty politics is past, the next century will bring the struggle for the dominion of the world." It was in keeping with this purpose and plan that the Kaiser declared some years ago to his people: "Our future lies on the sea"; that he and his associates in government planned a great colonial empire. As another German professor tells us, writing some years ago: "If we do not soon acquire new territory a frightful catastrophe is inevitable. It signifies little whether it be in Brazil, in Siberia, in Anatolia, or in South Africa." Anywhere in the world they were ready to seize the

best. They recognized no rights on the part of the existing population. The fact that Germany wanted land gave her a moral right to take it at the expense of the property and lives of its present occupants, or of anybody else. "Let us," says Karl Wagner, "let us bravely organize great forced migrations of the inferior peoples.....The inefficient must be hemmed in and at last driven into reserves where they have no room to grow.....and where, discouraged and rendered indifferent to the future by the spectacle of the superior energy of their conquerors, they may crawl slowly towards the peaceful death of weary and hopeless senility."

But the dough must be leavened before it can be baked. Therefore Germans must be scattered over the world and wherever possible brought together into localities which will develop a German spirit and German point of view, and secure a dominating influence on the public opinion and politics of the country. Later on these groups will serve admirably as centers around which to organize new colonies under the German flag!

These, then, are the main outlines of the plan of the German autocracy to bring the world into subjection. Can any man understand this plan and fail to see that its attainment would strike at the roots of liberty, free government and democracy everywhere? The insidious influence and power of autocracy would be established in a multitude of centers scattered over the globe, like the suckers on the tentacles of a mighty devilfish, whose body rested on and drew its sustenance and strength from the main part of the autocratic empire. Sensitive to every touch, its body would react to throw its strength wherever there was an opportunity to attach a tentacle, or a sucker on a tentacle, to a new object that it could absorb, and whose life it could destroy. There would be no safety for a freedom-loving people anywhere on the globe, because these tentacles of influence and power would be continually reaching out and constantly growing. No nation, not even our own, would have been able to stand up alone with any assurance of ultimate success against such a power. At any rate, ultimate success by us in such a struggle, when it came,

would have had to be attained at a cost of life, form of government, and all that democracies hold dear, which would have made men pause and ask whether the struggle were worth while.

Laying down as their fundamental and unchallengeable premise that what the Germans want is right, and that since they wish to expand, to seize other people's land and dominate the world, they, as the chosen people of Almighty God, have a right to do it; that no such word as "wrong" can be recognized in their vocabulary; the defendants of the monstrous program of German autocracy make certain claims in their own defense and certain complaints which we will proceed briefly to examine.

Being very scientific, by a perversion of reasoning, they argue that what they call the biological law of life, the right of the fittest to survive, confers upon the strong the right to extirpate the weak. They do not ask who is fittest to survive. They beg the question by taking it for granted that the only being fit to survive is the one endowed with brute strength. They then confuse the exertion of brute force with moral right. In short, in this matter they have followed the custom which runs through all German political and philosophical as well as psychological arguments. They first have made up their minds what they want to establish, and then they interpret the data which they have at hand in such a way as to sustain their point. I have read a good deal of German political and economic literature in the past fifteen years, and have been impressed every time with this fact. They prove what they want to prove, and show either a real indifference to the facts, or a complete failure to realize that they are not on their side.

Concerning the German claim of their right to expand, it may be said, in reply, that no country has ever objected to receiving desirable members of the fatherland who in years past have left her shores. No better citizens of our own country have come from any part of the world than those of German stock. It would have been a great thing for German moral and educational influence to spread over the civilized world through the impress of the character and training of her

sons and daughters. But this was not enough to satisfy the autocratic government of the Empire. Wherever a German goes he must still remain a German, and retain his connections with the home government! The flag must be established and the language spoken wherever Germans go! The right to expansion in this sense is, of course, a right that the world cannot grant.

With reference to the German claim that they are waging a war of defense and not of conquest, it would be laughable if it were not tragic, to see how they have shifted their ground. The utterances of every spokesman of the Teutonic Empire at the outbreak of the war, the literature of Germany for more than a generation, her state of preparedness to wage war, and her utter neglect to attempt to stay the beginning of war, are all evidence that she entered the conflict with a desire, and purpose, and intention, for conquest. To be sure, when she found herself hemmed in and unable to advance further, especially on the western front and, indeed, on the eastern, until the Russian collapse, then we find a change of tone. Through the utterances of her spokesmen now there runs the note of that whine which characterizes them in defeat. Some people "cannot stand the gaff." They lack the spirit of sport.

Germany claims, as she has claimed for a generation, that she has been forced to become a military state, to develop the strongest army in the world in self-defense. "On the one side," she says, "we are threatened with the eruption of the barbarian hordes of Russia; while on the other hostile peoples hem us in. We must always be in a position to defend ourselves." If Germany had developed her military strength only far enough to enable her to repel attacks, the world might take this view and sympathize with this argument, but she went far beyond this. Of the danger of the Russian bogey and French revenge, I shall speak later.

Again, Germany declares that one nation after another has blocked her program of expansion, has kept her from finding her "place in the sun." This tune has been harped on very strongly, especially with reference to Great Britain, largely for consumption in this country. We have been told with an iter-

ation that has become tiresome, that Great Britain was trying to prevent German commercial expansion, and throttle German trade. There is not a scrap of proof in diplomatic correspondence or political history since Germany became an empire that lays a sufficient warrant for such a statement. Great Britain is and has been a free-trade nation. Her ports have been open to the ships of all the world on the same terms as to her own. The ports of her independent colonies have been open to the ships of all the world, including those of the mother-country, on the same terms. All that the Germans had to do was to do the service better and cheaper than the British, and they could have the carrying trade of Canada, Australia or Great Britain herself. The only possible ground for taking any other view is that certain lines of British ships received high pay, which some called subsidies, in return for mail service, in order that the government might be at liberty to take them over as cruisers in event of war. But these so-called subsidies were for a few passenger lines traveling certain routes, and had no reference to the great mass of British shipping. German steamship companies had docks in various parts of the British Empire, including India, as well as in the British Isles themselves. When, however, the German complainants of alleged British monopoly forgot themselves, as they did once in a while, they told the world that Germany was driving British commerce from the seas; that the world over German trade was driving out British. Now both statements could not be true. That is, it could not be true that Great Britain was throttling German commercial expansion and at the same time that German commerce was driving out British all over the world. The truth is that neither statement was correct. British trade during the years when her foreign critics and some of her own renegade people called her a decaying nation, was advancing by leaps and bounds, as statistics will show. So was that of Germany. And no one welcomed the German expansion more frankly and cheerfully than did the statesmen of Great Britain. When Germany was beginning her colonial program in 1884, Mr. Gladstone said: "If Germany is to become a colonizing power all I can say is God

speed her." And Mr. Chamberlain added: "If foreign nations are determined to pursue distant colonial enterprises we have no right to prevent them." In 1911 Sir Edward Grey said the same thing in almost the same words. Similar statements are on record from authoritative British statesmen and publicists with reference to German commerce.

No evidence has ever been produced to show that any one or all of these countries had any designs upon the peaceful development of the German Empire. The Entente Alliance between Great Britain, France and Russia was, on the other hand, a measure entered into as a protection against threatened German aggression. The policy of Germany was to sow dissension among the other states of Europe, keeping them apart while she herself maintained, through the Triple Alliance, a solid barrier of force separating eastern Europe from western.

In order to create prejudice in her favor, German writers have dwelt strongly upon the bogey of navalism, and when militarism has been criticised have immediately brought out this jack-in-the-box to make an impression. Unthinking or prejudiced individuals among ourselves, not fully acquainted with the facts, have been caught by the phrase. The world has objected to German militarism in the sense that it was a mighty military organization, created for the purposes of aggression, and in ways that made its use for aggression not only possible but almost certain. No such statement can be made of the alleged British navalism. Search the history of the past hundred years and you will find that the preponderant British navy has been used not for the subjugation of alien peoples and the imposition of foreign law upon unwilling subjects, but has been engaged in suppressing piracy, in advancing the interests of science, and in no case has been an aggressor. Nor can a great naval power dominate in the same sense that a great military power can do so. For it has been proven over and over again, the latest instance being the Gallipoli campaign, that navies cannot overcome land defenses and military power. But the country which, with a strong navy, backed by a mighty army, is able to effect a landing, can then use its military strength for subjugation. The term "freedom of the seas"

has been used to conjure with, and to attack British policy. But the seas have been open and free, the British navy to the contrary, to the ships of every nation for more than a hundred years. Indeed, they have been open because of the British navy. I have been often puzzled to understand just what the Germans meant by the freedom of the seas. Lately, however, I have run across the explanation. Here it is as recently given in one of our newspapers: "In March, 1917, Count Reventlow explained the phrase at a great meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic Hall. On the authority of the Naval and Military Record of England this bloodthirsty person thus put himself on record: 'What does Germany understand by the freedom of the seas? Of course we do not mean by it the free use of the seas, which is the common privilege of all nations in time of peace, or the right to the open highways of international trade. That sort of freedom of the seas we had before the war. What we understand today by this doctrine,' he continued, 'is that Germany should possess such maritime territories and such naval bases that at the outbreak of war we should be able with our navy reasonably ready, to guarantee ourselves the command of the seas. We want such a jumping-off place for our navy as would give us a fair chance of dominating the seas and of being free on the seas during a war.'"

Again, the Germans have tried to create a prejudice against Great Britain by harping upon the mightiness of the British Empire. They have found it, in their writings and speeches, rotten and ready to fall apart—because that was what they wanted. It was amusing to me when I was in Germany to see the assurance with which the Germans talked of misrule of Great Britain in her colonies, and of the certainty with which these colonies would desert her in her hour of trial. Their conversation and their writings showed that they knew nothing at all about the real facts of the situation. They had listened, as even some in our neighborhood here had listened and taken at one hundred per cent value, the diatribes of a few discontented foreigners. The answer to the criticism that the British Empire should be broken up because it was a tyranny has been found in the glorious response of the Empire in this war.

As I have already said, another claim of the Germans in defense of their program of expansion was that Russia was a menace to her. Slav barbarism threatens to overwhelm us, they said. Our ignorance of real conditions in Russia made it easy for us to believe this. But the claim could be shown to be in large measure untrue. Without, however, entering into the merits of that question, it is sufficient to point out that on this point as on others the German statements were inconsistent. While professing a fear of Slav domination, they constantly expressed contempt for Russia's military strength. They had no reason to fear her if they were not afraid of her army.

At another time it was France that blocked the way of this chosen people of God in their program of robbery and murder. Therefore, France must be punished, and in their phrase "bled white" beyond recovery. I will not insult your intelligence by answering this claim.

Finally, in order that the world and posterity might be satisfied that she was a much abused and deeply wronged nation by all the rest of the world, Germany told us that the United States of America has been in recent years following a policy that blocked her way. "What do you people want with the Philippines?" is the question that was frequently asked of Americans in the days immediately following the Spanish war. Germany went as far as she dared during our Spanish war to impede our operations, and to secure the Philippine Islands for herself. She secured a foothold in the Samoan Islands, and attempted to secure one in Venezuela.

In short, in seeking to attain her aim of world domination Germany has planned to absorb her small neighbors and destroy the British Empire, to inculcate propaganda favorable to herself in every country where her interests could be subserved thereby. She has established agencies for corrupting and undermining public opinion in every country of the globe where her plans could thereby be furthered. She has established through her emigrants in different countries groups strong enough to dominate opinion and action, or to try to set up in time a new state under German Government, as in Brazil. She

has used the gains of every war and every diplomatic struggle as the basis for future aggression. She has permitted nothing to be done in world politics for twenty years without insisting on having her "share," whether she had an interest in the particular matter or not. She shook her mailed fist at Morocco and rattled her sword at Manila. She has insidiously tried to destroy the industrial and commercial plants of other countries, and undermine their economic and social organization. She has stirred up internal dissensions by bribery and the dissemination of falsehoods, and has even gone so far as to stir up foreign enemies against countries which supposed she was their friend.

Not only has the German autocracy thrown the shadow of its sinister designs across the path of the world's progress, but in its immediate methods of carrying out its purposes, it has crucified humanity and has violated every principle of kindness and righteousness. Under the instruction of their military staff, the German army went into Belgium and northern France with the avowed purpose of so terrorizing the inhabitants that the world would be afraid to oppose the Germans. The belief on their part that such was human nature not only casts a reflection on their good sense, but makes one wonder whether they themselves are the kind of people they thought the rest of us were. In their conduct of the war they have defied and broken treaties and international law whenever and wherever it suited their purpose, and they stand today before the judgment bar of God and men as a people forsworn. They have violated every moral principle, in the commission of robbery, murder and rape. Neither age, sex nor condition has been a protection against their violence. Old men, women and even babes in arms—it made no difference, all must be trampled in the march of their glorious army. It would have been bad enough if such conduct had gone only so far as it could be defended reasonably on military grounds, if ever military grounds require such conduct; but no shadow of excuse that will stand the test of a moment's thought can be brought forward that will justify the treatment of Belgium and of northern France. The evidence is abundant and unimpeach-

able. We need not seek the testimony of outsiders. We need rely only on the private diaries of German soldiers and officers, official proclamations and the photographs of the outraged, the dead and the dying.

They have destroyed private property and desolated the country that they have occupied—even while prating about the sacredness of private property at sea! No one who knows them and their program doubts for a moment that this is done in accordance with official plans for the very purpose of making it impossible for a desolated land to be their competitors in the future. "Anybody who knows the present state of things in Belgian industry will agree with me," says Deputy Beumer of the Prussian Diet, "that it must take at least some years—assuming that Belgium is independent at all—before Belgium can even think of competing with us in the world market. And anybody who has traveled, as I have done, through the occupied districts of France, will agree with me that so much damage has been done to industrial property that no one need be a prophet in order to say that it will take more than ten years before we need think of France as a competitor or of the reestablishment of French industry." Here, then, we have the real motive of the utter desolation which the Germans have wrought in the occupied territory.

Again, contrary to international law and the custom of war, for generations, they have resorted to the practices of the Middle Ages by imposing fines on conquered and occupied cities.

They have violated the treaties of generations, the conduct of honorable soldiers, the law of nations, and the tenets of modern civilization by seizing hostages, making them responsible for the acts of other people, and murdering them to suit their pleasure.

They have violated military law by killing unofficial civilians. They have violated military law, international law, their own specific pledges, and the law of humanity, by using civilians, including even women and children, as screens before their advancing soldiers in battle. They have outraged the conscience of the world, violated international agreement and set civilization back, by restoring slavery through the deporta-

tion of defenseless inhabitants of conquered territory, tearing them from their families and transporting them to work in Germany or elsewhere.

Through their piratical submarine attacks they have violated international law, restored piracy and committed murder, even of neutrals on peaceful ships, innocent travelers,—men, women, girls, boys and babes in arms.

They have gone back to the war practices of five centuries ago by their cowardly use of poison gases that inflict the most awful tortures, so that their opponents are more than justified in the moderate criticism which they have made, that the Germans are “not clean fighters.”

They have been guilty of inhumanity and violating law by killing the wounded, by attacking hospitals and Red Cross ambulances, and by attacking undefended cities. They have placed themselves in the same class with the fanatical Turks, by condoning the massacre of Armenians. Do you doubt the truth of these statements? (Out of their own mouths again, judge them.

I give a single instance out of many in each case. As to robbery: “After living about a week in a chateau near Liege, His Royal Highness, Prince Eitel Fritz, the Duke of Brunswick, and another nobleman of less importance, had all the dresses that could be found in the wardrobes belonging to the lady of the house and her daughters packed before their own eyes and sent to Germany.”

As to incendiarism: “The village was surrounded and the soldiers posted one yard apart so that no one could escape. Then the Uhlans set fire to the place one house after another. No man, woman or child could possibly escape. Any one trying to escape was shot.”

As to murder, here is one case: “All the villagers fled. The dead were all buried, numbering 60. Among them were many old men and women. Three children were clasped in each others arms and had died thus.”

As to outrages on women and children, I dare not quote.

As to killing the wounded, I need but recall the order of General Stenger: “No prisoners are to be taken. All prisoners, whether wounded or not, must be slaughtered.”

As to sheltering themselves behind women and others in battle, hear Lieut. Eberlein: "I made them sit on chairs in the middle of the street.....The civilians whom they had put in the same way in the middle of the street were killed by French bullets. I saw their dead bodies."

As to killing prisoners, I have already quoted General Stenger.

As to being liars about their conduct, I need not quote. Read almost any statement of their military chiefs or of any pro-German.

As to the deportation of civilians, and the restoration of slavery on a scale unparalleled since the days of the Calmuck Tartars, read the statements of your own Ambassador Gerard and other Americans who were on the ground.

Then as to the general character of their procedure in the conduct of the war, listen to the testimony of one of our own distinguished fellow-citizens, Mr. F. C. Walcott, one of Mr. Hoover's staff in Belgium.

A year ago I went to Poland to learn its facts concerning the remnant of a people that had been decimated by war. The country had been twice devastated. First the Russian army swept through it and then the Germans. Along the roadside from Warsaw to Pinsk, the present firing line 230 miles, near half a million people had died of hunger and cold. The way was strewn with their bones picked clean by the crows. With their usual thrift, the Germans were collecting the larger bones to be milled into fertilizer, but finger and toe bones lay on the ground with the mud covered and rain soaked clothing.

Wicker baskets were scattered along the way—the basket in which the baby swings from the rafters in every peasant home. Every mile there were scores of them, each one telling a death. I started to count, but after a little I had to give it up, there were so many.

That is the desolation one saw along the great road from Warsaw to Pinsk, mile after mile, more than two hundred miles. They told me a million people were made homeless in six weeks of the Ger-

man drive in August and September, 1916. They told me four hundred thousand died on the way.....

In the refugee camps, 300,000 survivors of the flight were gathered by the Germans, members of broken families. They were lodged in jerry-built barracks, scarcely water-proof, unlighted, unwarmed in the dead of winter. Their clothes, where the buttons were lost, were sewed on. There were no conveniences, they had not even been able to wash for weeks. Filth and infection from vermin were spreading. They were famished, their daily ration a cup of soup and a piece of bread as big as my fist.....

.....In that situation, the German commander issued a proclamation. Every able-bodied Pole was bidden to Germany to work. If any refused, let no other Pole give him to eat, not so much as a mouthful, under penalty of German military law.

This is the choice the German Government gives to the conquered Pole, to the husband and father of a starving family: Leave your family to die or survive as the case may be. Leave your country which is destroyed, to work in Germany for its further destruction. If you are obstinate, we shall see that you surely starve.

Staying with his folk, he is doomed and they are not saved; the father and husband can do nothing for them, he only adds to their risk and suffering. Leaving them, he will be cut off from his family, they may never hear from him again nor he from them. Germany will set him to work that a German workman may be released to fight against his own land and people. He shall be lodged in barracks, behind barbed wire entanglements, under armed guard. He shall be scantily fed and his earnings shall be taken from him to pay for his food.

That is the choice which the German Government offers to a proud, sensitive, high-strung people. Death or slavery.

When a Pole gave me that proclamation, I was boiling. But I had to restrain myself. I was practically the only foreign civilian in the country and I wanted to get food to the people. That was what I was there for and I must not for any cause jeopardize

the undertaking. I asked Governor General von Beseler, "Can this be true?"

"Really, I cannot say," he replied, "I have signed so many proclamations; ask General von Kries."

So I asked General von Kries. "General, this is a civilized people. Can this be true?"

"Yes," he said, "it is true"—with an air of adding, "Why not?"

I dared not trust myself to speak; I turned to go. "Wait," he said. And he explained to me how Germany, official Germany, regards the state of subject peoples.

This, then, men and women of America, is, so far, the story. Let us turn back, quietly still, and read a little history.

The writings of many Germans make it clear that the anticipated success in the present war was to be a basis for future action against ourselves. Sixteen years ago a professor of history in the Royal Academy in Posen and the Academy in Berlin, Dr. Hotsch, wrote: "The most dangerous foe of Germany in this generation will prove to be the United States." Lieut. Edelsheim wrote, in 1901: "Operations against the United States of North America must be entirely different. With that country in particular political friction manifest in commercial aims has not been lacking in recent years, and has until now been removed chiefly through acquiescence on our part. However, as this submission has its limit, the question arises as to what means we can develop to carry out our purpose with force in order to combat the encroachments of the United States upon our interests.....If the German invading force were equipped and ready for transporting the moment the battle fleet is dispatched under average conditions, these corps can begin operations on American soil within at least four weeks.....The United States at this time is not in a position to oppose our troops with an army of equal rank.As a matter of fact, Germany is the only great power which is in a position to conquer the United States."

Still another writer, in 1897, expressed the opinion that "the Monroe doctrine lacks as yet a justification in the unified

character of the people"! Still another tells us: "It is therefore the duty of every one who loves languages to see that the future language spoken in America shall be German."

In 1903 Vollert wrote: "From all this it appears that the Monroe doctrine cannot be justified.....And so it remains only what we Europeans almost universally consider it, an impertinence." So distinguished an authority as the economist Schmoller wrote some years ago: "We most desire that at any cost a German country containing some 20 or 30 million Germans may grow up in the coming century in Brazil..... Unless our connection with Brazil is always secured by ships of war, and unless Germany is able to exercise pressure there our development is threatened."

Another professor of political economy (Schulze-Gaevernitz) wrote in 1898: "The more Germany is condemned to an attitude of peaceful resistance toward the United States, the more emphatically must she defend her interests in Central and South America where she today occupies an authoritative position.....For this purpose we need a fleet capable not only of coping with the miserable forces of South American states but powerful enough if the need should arise to cause Americans to think twice before making any attempt to apply an economic Monroe doctrine in South America. Still again, we are told by another that it depends on the political situation when Germany shall take possession of a harbor in Venezuela. Before doing so, however, this writer tells his fellow-countrymen that they should determine first whether they are to acquiesce in the American order of "hands off in South America."

In 1904 Friedrich Lange asserted that all the republics of South America would accept the advice of the German Government and listen to reason, either voluntarily or under coercion, while two years later another wrote that not only North America but the whole of America must become perhaps the strongest fortress of the Germanic races. This is one of the writers who advocated the sending of people of non-Germanic blood now living in South America to Africa so as to have "a free South America for those of Germanic blood." This was twelve years ago. At about the same time another aspirant for his

country's expansion told the world that Germany would take under her protection the republics of Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay, and other parts of South America where Germans had settled predominantly.

Still again, in 1915, Professor Hettner of Heidelberg told his countrymen that in treating with America German public opinion was to some extent lacking in courage. "Just because the United States has set up the Monroe doctrine to exclude Europeans from America it does not follow that we should acquiesce in that doctrine."

Throwing a flood of light on the opinions which I have quoted concerning the attitude of Germany towards the United States, is the story told by Major N. A. Bailey and published in the New York Tribune, August 11, 1915. It is as follows: "At the close of the Spanish-American War, I was returning on the Santee—I think it was—from Santiago, Cuba, to Montauk Point. On board there was a military attaché from Germany, Count von Goetzen, a personal friend of the Kaiser. Apropos of a discussion between Count von Goetzen and myself on the friction between Admiral Dewey and the German Admiral at Manila, von Goetzen said to me: 'About 15 years from now my country will start her great war. She will be in Paris in about two months after the commencement of hostilities. Her move on Paris will be but a step to her real object—the crushing of England. Everything will move like clockwork. We will be prepared and others will not be prepared. I speak of this because of the connection which it will have with your own country. Some months after we finish our work in Europe we will take New York and probably Washington and hold them for some time. We will put your country in its place with reference to Germany. We do not purpose to take any of your territory, but we do intend to take a billion or more dollars from New York and other places. The Monroe doctrine will be taken charge of by us, as we will then have put you in your place, and we will take charge of South America, as far as we want to.'"

Finally, we have to bear in mind the remark of the gentleman who has several times proclaimed that he took his stand

beside his allies in shining armor, the Emperor himself. Ambassador Gerard tells us that in conversation with him the Emperor repeatedly said: "America had better look out after this war," and "I shall stand no nonsense from America after the War."

The sentiments that have been described above have come to the surface on several occasions in the history of the past two decades. The story of the attitude and interference of the German Admiral Diedrichs with the operations of Admiral Dewey and his attempt, without success, to persuade the British Admiral to take the same view, are well known. Yet Chancellor von Bulow, speaking in the Reichstag in 1899 evidently approved the truculent attitude of his Admiral. He said among other things, that the need of Germany for coaling stations was most clearly indicated at the time of the Spanish-American war, and that the introduction in the Reichstag of a bill for the increase of the German navy was justified by the occurrences of the Spanish-American war, the disturbances in Samoa and the war in South Africa.

In connection with the Spanish war, not only did the German Admiral by his actions show contempt for the American fleet, but he gave indirect aid to our enemy; he interfered as far as he dared in an obstructive way in the operations of Dewey's fleet, and tried the patience of our Admiral almost to the breaking point. Later on the same commander in the same cruiser, the *Panther*, slipped into a harbor of Venezuela and endeavored to get a foothold there. German influence has been thrown against the construction and the control of the Panama Canal by ourselves and against the purchase by us of the Danish West India Islands.

In spite of this fearful indictment, in spite of this long series of truculent acts against every people in the world who were imagined by German leaders to stand in their way, we still find some of our people asking why we went into the war! We went in for a variety of reasons.

In the first place, we were called on as one of the leaders of humanity to take a stand in defense of civilization, righteousness and law. When our forefathers published the Decla-

ration of Independence they said that among other reasons for issuing their statement was a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. No such respect has been shown by the German Government in this war, or the incidents that preceded it. Has a man no duty when he sees his neighbor beaten, robbed or murdered? Has a people, a country, a nation no duty to act when it sees the principles for which it stands trampled to the earth; and its neighbors maltreated, robbed and murdered? Has a nation no duty, nay, has a nation no interest to protect, when it sees principles and practices antagonistic to its own existence established in a neighboring community? The answer is given in our own Declaration of Independence when the writers said that one of the causes for rebelling was the attempt of the king of Great Britain to establish in a neighboring province a government that would be inimical to our own. Every principle and precept of humanity, the duty to defend righteousness and law among nations, every interest involved in the maintenance of our own democratic form of government, called us to join in this war.

Again, were we to stand apart when the moral sense of the world was outraged by the murder and oppression of the people of Belgium and northern France? What defense can a man or a nation offer if he stands passive and silently acquiesces in such deeds as the massacre of the Armenians, the Serbians and the Poles, and the enslavement of the Belgians? Is it worthy of a free people to refuse to resent such things as the murder of Edith Cavell, or Captain Fryatt, or the innocent travelers on the Lusitania?

We said we went to war with Spain to free the people of Cuba from tyranny and misery and give them an opportunity to live as freemen. That is a humanitarian motive. Did we lie? If we did not, then such a motive justifies our entry into this war.

But there are more important reasons for our intervention. Our pride and national dignity have been insulted by the system of propaganda which has undertaken to corrupt and undermine our public opinion, to falsify and to destroy our political and moral ideals, to interfere with our industry and

trade by the destruction, at the risk of life, of industrial and other establishments. As a far-seeing people we are called on to interpose ourselves to prevent the growth of an autocratic government to a point of strength where at its leisure and pleasure it can defy that Monroe doctrine which we have regarded as one of the greatest safeguards of liberty in the western hemisphere.

But even more specifically: We were insultingly told that we must not sell munitions of war. Apparently it was the high prerogative of the German nation to do this to any belligerent, but we might not do it if it injured or even displeased the German autocracy. We patiently pleaded our cause, showing the reasons for our action. The German Government tried to stir up internal sentiment against us. She then issued her edicts about shipping. We protested against attacks on neutral ships by submarines and particularly against the sinking of neutral vessels or of any vessel in ways contrary to maritime international law endangering the lives of the crew and passengers. Pretending to acquiesce, the German Government waited for an opportune time, when she had increased the number of her submarines, and then defied the request and the wish of the United States. She sent to an untimely death innocent children and women as well as men, and in too many instances her submarine commanders sank vessels in such a way as to make it almost impossible for passengers or crew to survive. "Sink them so that not a trace will be left behind" seems to have been the order of other representatives of the German Government than the fool who spoke for it in Buenos Aires. "Public policy prompted by the emotions is stupidity. Humanitarian dreams are imbecility. Diplomatic charity begins at home. Statesmanship is business. Right and wrong are notions indispensable in private life. The German people are always right because they number 87,000,000 souls."

But why prolong the horrible story? If in the face of the evidence easily accessible to all, and only part of which I have touched upon, there is any one among us who still is in doubt about the wisdom and necessity of our entering the war, then he would not listen if the country were covered with the in-

vaders and we were experiencing the same ruthlessness that has befallen the people of Belgium, Serbia, Poland, Armenia and France. If any one now does not believe that it has been the set purpose of the imperial German Government to dominate the earth, to destroy democracy and establish autocracy, then he too must be one of those 87 million German people who are always right because they are German.

Therefore, fellow-citizens, in going to Europe to fight side by side with glorious Britain, heroic France and courageous Italy, we are simply defending our own shores, our own lives, our own families. For it is as clear as the sunlight that if German autocracy succeeds in establishing its aims on the continent of Europe, the Republic of America will be the next victim. And if we had not undertaken to stem the rising tide of slavery and terror on the other side of the Atlantic we would have found it necessary to do it on this side alone. It would not have been only the burning of New York, or Boston, or Washington, or Charleston; it would not have been only the imposition of fines and indemnities of billions of dollars; it would not have meant merely the destruction of our property and the robbery of our sustenance; it would have meant the dishonor or the death, or both, of those who are dear to us; it would have meant the destruction of that great national spirit and national organization which has been established and cemented by the blood of our fathers; it would have meant the turning back of the liberty of the individual and the world to the conditions of five centuries ago; it would have meant the blotting out of that spirit of freedom, that spirit of independence, that spirit of duty, that spirit of high idealism, which we like to characterize as American; it would have meant that instead of America's being, as she always has been, the hope of the world, she would take her place among the beaten and degraded and enslaved nations under the heel of an emperor who claims to represent God, and whose shining armor, no longer shining, but begrimed with the blood of the innocent and the weak, is still waving his sword in defiance of law and order and right.

Think about these things. Go home, look at your barns, and remember that if "This Thing" comes to our shores it will be well for you to burn them before the invader does. Look at your crops and your trees. If he reaches our shores cut them down and burn them. It will be better to do that than to let them fall into his hands. Look at your wife and your daughters, and be ready to follow the example of Virginus, in ancient Rome. For it were better that they were dead. Think of the liberty you have enjoyed, and choose to lie dead rather than give it up. Think of the country of which you are a part and which your fathers and yourself have helped to build up, and make up your mind to lay it desolate in universal ruin according to your own way, because if you do not and are beaten it will be done in the invader's way.

To prevent these things is our task. "To such a task," in the words of our great President, "we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are, and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other."

I see a vision! "I see a drumhead court-martial.¹ I see an English woman, tall, sweet-faced and pale. I see her calm under the lash of words of torment. I see her led away. I see her blindfolded as six men with rifles step away. I see the garments torn, exposing her left breast so that they will need no other white mark to reach her heart. I hear a command. I hear a report. A form crumples into a grave, and a soul takes flight to the God that gave it."

But wait. My eye turns back to our own land. A messenger boy with a thin yellow envelope in his hand has just entered a quiet cottage in central Illinois. The messenger leaves. The father and mother sit alone dry eyed and still. By and by the woman, rising, goes to her husband and taking one lapel of his coat in each hand she shakes him fiercely, and

¹From "The Cross of Gold," by C. F. Johnson, Twin Falls, Idaho.

says: "John, they have killed my boy in France, and I want you to **DO SOMETHING.**" So when 500,000 more or less are murdered in France, and parents begin to go all over the nation saying "They have killed my boy in France, won't you, and you, and you, do something?" we will plow, and dig, and mine, and nail, and work, and think, and pray and fight. And still the call will ring in our ears: They've killed my boy in France; won't you do something? and, by the Eternal God, we will!

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 547 227 9